International Journal of Organizational Innovation

THE 7C FRAMEWORK FOR INNOVATION MANAGEMENT: A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO THE HUMAN SIDE OF CORPORATE INNOVATION

Dr. Sydney Engelberg,
Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel
sydneye@hotmail.com

Abstract

Innovation management has traditionally focused on methodological approaches while often neglecting the human psychological factors that drive successful corporate innovation. This paper offers a 7C Framework, which addresses this gap by providing a comprehensive approach to managing the human side of innovation within large organizations. The framework encompasses seven critical dimensions: Culture (understanding and integrating diverse values and practices), Communication (ensuring clear cross-disciplinary dialogue), Competence (developing necessary skills and knowledge), Commitment (fostering employee engagement and loyalty), Consistency (maintaining harmony across organizational units), Compliance (adhering to legal and ethical standards), and Cost-Effectiveness (managing innovation costs while maintaining quality). Through analysis of contemporary literature and the framework's components, this paper demonstrates how the 7C model provides organizations with a systematic approach to creating collaborative innovation environments. The framework's emphasis on ecological insight and community-based innovation offers practical guidance for organizations seeking to improve their innovation outcomes by focusing on human factors and interpersonal relationships. Key findings suggest that successful innovation requires not only methodological rigor but also careful attention to organizational culture, communication patterns, and human resource development. The 7C Framework contributes to innovation management theory by providing a holistic model that bridges the gap between technical innovation processes and human organizational dynamics.

Keywords: innovation management, organizational culture, corporate innovation, human factors, 7C framework, collaboration

Introduction

Innovation has become a critical driver of organizational success in to-

day's rapidly evolving business environment. However, despite significant advances in innovation methodologies and frameworks, many organizations continue to struggle with implementing effective innovation strategies. Dobni (2008) notes in his comprehensive study on innovation culture that organizations often fail to develop the cultural foundations necessary for sustained innovation success. A fundamental challenge identified by researchers and practitioners is that traditional innovation approaches often fail to adequately address the human side of corporate innovation— the psychology of individuals involved, their behavioral patterns, and the complex web of relationships that exist within large organizations. As Schein and Schein (2017) emphasize in their seminal work on organizational culture and leadership, the pattern of shared basic assumptions that groups learn significantly influences how they approach innovation challenges.

In this paper, I introduce a comprehensive framework that directly addresses this critical gap. The 7C Framework for Innovation Management represents a paradigm shift from purely methodological approaches toward a more holistic understanding of innovation as a fundamentally human and collaborative endeavor. As Engelberg (2025) emphasizes, "It takes a community to innovate," highlighting the essential role of interpersonal dynamics and organizational culture in driving successful innovation outcomes.

The central thesis of the 7C Framework is that finding effective ways to work with people outside the traditional innovation team may be the key to unlocking successful innovation within organizations. This perspective aligns with emerging research in organizational behavior and innovation management that emphasizes the importance of cross-functional collaboration, cultural alignment, and human factors in innovation processes. Tidd and Bessant (2020), in their comprehensive textbook "Managing Innovation: Integrating Technological, Market and Organizational Change," identify innovation management as involving the integration of technological opportunities with market needs within an organizational context that enables creativity and learning.

The 7C Framework is built around seven interconnected dimensions: Culture, Communication, Competence, Commitment, Consistency, Compliance, and Cost Effectiveness. Each dimension addresses specific aspects of the human and organizational factors that influence innovation success. Unlike traditional models that may focus primarily on technical or process-oriented aspects of innovation, the 7C Framework recognizes that sustainable innovation requires careful attention to the social, psychological, and cultural dimensions of organizational life.

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the 7C Framework, examining each dimension in detail and situating the framework within the broader context of innovation management theory and practice. Through integration with contemporary academic literature, this analysis demonstrates how the framework contributes to our understanding of innovation manage-

ment while providing practical guidance for organizations seeking to improve their innovation capabilities.

The significance of this framework extends beyond its practical applications. By explicitly addressing the human side of innovation, the 7C model contributes to theoretical discussions about the nature of innovation itself. It challenges purely technical or process-oriented conceptions of innovation by positioning human relationships, cultural dynamics, and organizational behavior as central to innovation success. This perspective has important implications for how organizations structure their innovation efforts, develop their human resources, and create environments conducive to creative collaboration.

The timing of this framework is particularly relevant given current organizational challenges. As organizations become increasingly complex and geographically distributed, the need for frameworks that can effectively manage diverse, professionally heterogeneous teams has become more critical than ever. The 7C Framework provides a structured approach to addressing these challenges while maintaining focus on innovation outcomes.

Literature Review

Theoretical Foundations of Innovation Management

Innovation management as a field of study has evolved significantly over the past several decades, with researchers developing increasingly sophisticated frameworks for understanding how organizations can systematically foster and manage innovation. Early approaches to innovation management focused primarily on technical and process-oriented aspects, often treating innovation as a linear progression from research and development to market implementation. Rothwell's (1994) influential work "Towards the Fifth-Generation Innovation Process" documented this evolution from linear models to more complex, networked approaches to innovation management. However, contemporary research has increasingly recognized the complex, multi-dimensional nature of innovation that requires attention to organizational, cultural, and human factors. Tidd and Bessant (2020) identify innovation management as involving the integration of technological opportunities with market needs within an organizational context that enables creativity and learning. This definition highlights the importance of organizational context—a theme that is central to understanding the relevance of frameworks like the 7C model. The organizational context includes not only formal structures and processes but also informal networks, cultural norms, and interpersonal relationships that shape how innovation actually occurs within organizations.

Organizational Culture and Innovation

The relationship between organizational culture and innovation has been extensively studied, with researchers consistently finding strong correlations between cultural factors and innovation performance. Schein and Schein (2017) define organizational culture as the pattern of shared basic assumptions that groups learn as they solve problems of external adaptation and internal integration. These assumptions, once proven successful, are

taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to organizational challenges. Dobni (2008) developed a comprehensive framework for understanding innovation culture that identifies four key dimensions: innovation intention (the organization's commitment to innovation), innovation infrastructure (the organizational systems and structures that support innovation), innovation influence (the factors that encourage or discourage innovative behavior), and innovation implementation (the processes through which innovations are developed and deployed). This framework demonstrates the multi-dimensional nature of innovation culture and highlights the importance of alignment across different organizational levels and functions.

Research by Ahmed (1998) in the European Journal of Innovation Management further emphasizes the importance of cultural factors in innovation, identifying several cultural characteristics associated with innovative organizations: challenge and involvement, freedom, trust and openness, idea time, playfulness and humor, conflict resolution, idea support, debate, and risk-taking. Ahmed's comprehensive framework for understanding innovation culture demonstrates how organizational climate directly influences innovative behavior. These characteristics align closely with several dimensions of the 7C Framework, particularly in areas related to culture, communication, and commitment.

Communication in Innovation Processes

Effective communication has been identified as a critical factor in innovation success, particularly in organizations with diverse professional backgrounds and complex structures. Cross and Sproull (2004), in their Organization Science article "More than an Answer: Information Relationships for Actionable Knowledge," examine how information and knowledge flow through organizational networks, emphasizing that innovation often emerges from the intersection of different knowledge domains and professional perspectives.

The concept of "boundary spanning" has become particularly important in innovation research. Boundary spanners are individuals who facilitate communication and knowledge transfer across different organizational units, disciplines, or external organizations. Tushman and Scanlan (1981), in their Academy of Management Journal article "Boundary Spanning Individuals: Their Role in Information Transfer and Their Antecedents," provided foundational research on how these individuals serve as critical links in organizational innovation networks. This concept is directly relevant to the Communication dimension of the 7C Framework, which emphasizes the need for clear, effective communication across different professional languages and disciplines.

Research by Leonard-Barton (1995) in "Wellsprings of Knowledge: Building and Sustaining the Sources of Innovation" on "core capabilities" highlights how organizational capabilities can become "core rigidities" when communication patterns become too insular or when organizations fail to

integrate diverse perspectives effectively. Leonard-Barton's longitudinal case studies demonstrate how successful organizations maintain dynamic capabilities through effective knowledge integration and communication practices. This research underscores the importance of maintaining open communication channels and actively managing the integration of diverse viewpoints—themes that are central to the 7C Framework's approach.

Human Factors in Innovation Management

The human factors approach to innovation management recognizes that innovation is fundamentally a human activity that requires careful attention to individual and group psychology, motivation, and behavior. This perspective has gained increasing attention as organizations recognize that technical solutions alone are insufficient for driving innovation success. Amabile (1998), in her influential Harvard Business Review article "How to Kill Creativity," identifies three components of individual creativity that are essential for innovation: domain-relevant skills, creativity-relevant skills, and task motivation. Her extensive research program demonstrates that environmental factors, including organizational culture, management practices, and work design, significantly influence individual creativity and, by extension, organizational innovation capability.

The concept of psychological safety, introduced by Edmondson (1999) in her Administrative Science Quarterly article "Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams," has become particularly important in innovation research. Edmondson defines psychological safety as individuals' perceptions of the consequences of taking interpersonal risks in their work environment. Her longitudinal studies across multiple organizational contexts consistently show that teams with higher levels of psychological safety are more likely to engage in the kind of risk-taking and experimentation that drives innovation.

Competence and Innovation

The relationship between organizational competencies and innovation has been extensively studied through the lens of the resource-based view of the firm and dynamic capabilities theory. Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997), in their seminal Strategic Management Journal article "Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management," define dynamic capabilities as the organization's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments. Their framework has become foundational for understanding how organizations develop and maintain competitive advantages through innovation.

In the context of innovation, competencies extend beyond technical skills to include what Leonard-Barton (1995) calls "core capabilities"—the knowledge, skills, technical systems, and values that distinguish an organization and provide competitive advantage. However, as organizations become more complex and innovation challenges become more interdisciplinary, the management of competencies becomes increasingly challenging.

Commitment and Innovation Culture
Employee commitment has been identified as a crucial factor in innovation success, with research showing strong relationships between various forms of organizational commitment and innovative behavior. Meyer and Allen (1991), in their Human Resource Management Review article "A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment," distinguish between three types of organizational commitment: affective commitment (emotional attachment to the organization), continuance commitment (commitment based on the costs of leaving), and normative commitment (commitment based on feelings of obligation). Their three-component model has become the dominant framework for understanding organizational commitment across various contexts.

Research by Ramamoorthy, Flood, Slattery, and Sardessai (2005) in Creativity and Innovation Management demonstrates that affective commitment is most strongly associated with innovative behavior, as employees who are emotionally attached to their organizations are more likely to engage in discretionary activities that support innovation. Their empirical study across multiple industries provides strong evidence for the importance of emotional engagement in driving innovative behaviors. This finding supports the 7C Framework's emphasis on fostering employee engagement and loyalty as essential components of innovation management.

Consistency and Compliance in Innovation

The tension between consistency and innovation has been a persistent theme in organizational research. While consistency in policies and practices can provide stability and efficiency, excessive consistency can also stifle creativity and innovation. March (1991), in his influential Organization Science article "Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning," describes this as the tension between exploitation (refining existing capabilities) and exploration (developing new capabilities). March's framework has become central to understanding how organizations balance the competing demands of efficiency and innovation.
The compliance dimension of innovation management has received less attention in academic literature but is increasingly important as organizations face growing regulatory requirements and ethical expectations. Compliance in innovation involves not only adherence to legal requirements but also ethical considerations related to the impact of innovations on various stakeholders.

Cost-Effectiveness in Innovation Management

The economic dimensions of innovation management have been extensively studied, with researchers examining how organizations can balance the costs of innovation activities with their potential returns. Cooper, Edgett, and Kleinschmidt (2001), in their comprehensive book "Portfolio Management for New Products," identify portfolio management as a critical capability for managing innovation investments effectively, emphasizing the need for systematic approaches to resource allocation and project selection. Their stage-gate process has been widely adopted across industries as a framework for managing innovation portfolios.

The concept of "frugal innovation" has gained attention as organizations seek to develop innovations that are both effective and cost-efficient. Radjou, Prabhu, and Ahuja (2012), in their book "Jugaad Innovation: Think Frugal, Be Flexible, Generate Breakthrough Growth," define frugal innovation as the ability to create significantly more value for customers while using fewer resources. Their research on innovation practices in emerging markets has influenced how organizations worldwide approach cost-effective innovation. This concept aligns with the Cost-Effectiveness dimension of the 7C Framework, which emphasizes managing innovation costs while maintaining high standards.

The 7C Framework for Innovation Management

The 7C Framework represents a comprehensive approach to innovation management that explicitly addresses the human and organizational factors that drive innovation success. Unlike traditional frameworks that may focus primarily on technical or process-oriented aspects, the 7C model recognizes innovation as fundamentally a social and collaborative endeavor. This section provides detailed analysis of each dimension of the framework.

Culture: Ecological Insight and Diversity Integration.

The Culture dimension of the 7C Framework emphasizes what Engelberg (2025) terms "ecological insight" - the ability to understand and integrate diverse values, practices, and expectations into a coherent innovation strategy. This approach recognizes that modern organizations are characterized by professional diversity, with employees bringing different educational backgrounds, cultural perspectives, and professional orientations to their work. The ecological metaphor is particularly apt for understanding organizational culture in innovation contexts. Just as ecological systems thrive through diversity and interdependence, innovative organizations benefit from the creative tension and crosspollination that occurs when diverse perspectives interact. However, this diversity must be actively managed to prevent fragmentation and ensure that different cultural elements contribute to rather than detract from innovation goals.

The framework's emphasis on integrating diverse values aligns with research on multicultural teams and diversity management. Thomas and Ely (1996), in their Harvard Business Review article "Making Differences Matter: A New Paradigm for Managing Diversity," identify three paradigms for

managing diversity: the discrimination-and-fairness paradigm, the access-and-legitimacy paradigm, and the learning-and-effectiveness paradigm. Their research demonstrates how the learning and-effectiveness paradigm, which views diversity as a resource for organizational learning and innovation, leads to superior performance outcomes. The 7C Framework's approach most closely aligns with the learning-and-effectiveness paradigm, which views diversity as a resource for learning, adaptation, and innovation.

Practical implementation of the Culture dimension requires organizations to develop what might be called "cultural intelligence"—the ability to recognize, understand, and leverage cultural differences for innovation purposes. This involves not only awareness of visible cultural differences but also deeper understanding of underlying values, assumptions, and practices that shape how different groups approach problem solving and creativity.

Communication: Cross-Disciplinary Dialogue

The Communication dimension addresses one of the most persistent challenges in innovation management: ensuring clear, effective, and thoughtful communication across different professional languages and disciplines. This challenge becomes particularly acute in complex organizations where innovation requires collaboration between individuals with vastly different educational backgrounds, professional experiences, and technical vocabularies.

The framework recognizes that effective communication in innovation contexts goes beyond simple information transfer. It requires what might be termed "translational communication"—the ability to translate concepts, ideas, and insights across professional boundaries in ways that preserve meaning while making information accessible to diverse audiences.

The framework's emphasis on "thoughtful communication" suggests a more deliberate and strategic approach to communication than is often practiced in organizational settings. Thoughtful communication involves not only careful consideration of message content but also attention to communication timing, medium, audience characteristics, and potential barriers to understanding.

Research on boundary spanning and knowledge integration supports the importance of this dimension. Carlile (2004), in his Organization Science article "Transferring, Translating, and Transforming: An Integrative Framework for Managing Knowledge Across Boundaries," identifies three types of boundaries that must be managed in innovation processes: syntactic boundaries (differences in language and terminology), semantic boundaries (differences in meaning and interpretation), and pragmatic boundaries (differences in interests and priorities). Carlile's framework provides a theoretical foundation for understanding the complexity of cross-boundary communication in innovation contexts. Effective communication in innovation requires strategies for managing all three types of boundaries.

The Communication dimension also addresses the challenge of maintaining dialogue rather than monologue

in innovation processes. True dialogue involves mutual exchange of ideas, active listening, and willingness to be influenced by others' perspectives. This type of communication is essential for the kind of collaborative innovation that the 7C Framework promotes.

Competence: Skills, Knowledge, Experience, and Attitude.

The Competence dimension of the 7C Framework takes a holistic approach to the capabilities required for innovation success. Rather than focusing solely on technical skills or knowledge, the framework identifies four interrelated components: skills, knowledge, experience, and attitude. This multi-dimensional view of competence reflects the complex and interdisciplinary nature of contemporary innovation challenges.

The inclusion of attitude as a component of competence is particularly noteworthy. While skills, knowledge, and experience are relatively tangible and measurable, attitude represents the psychological and motivational dimensions that influence how individuals apply their capabilities. Research on growth mindset by Dweck (2006) in "Mindset: The New Psychology of Success" demonstrates the importance of attitudes and beliefs in determining how individuals respond to challenges, setbacks, and learning opportunities—all of which are central to innovation processes. Dweck's extensive research shows how individuals with growth mindsets are more likely to persist through difficulties and learn from failures, essential characteristics for innovation success.

The framework's approach to competence also recognizes that innovation often requires capabilities that extend beyond any individual's expertise. This suggests the importance of what might be called "collaborative competence"—the ability to work effectively with others who possess complementary skills and knowledge. Collaborative competence includes not only technical collaboration skills but also the humility to recognize one's limitations and the curiosity to learn from others.

Experience, as identified in the framework, encompasses both direct experience with innovation processes and broader life and professional experiences that inform creative thinking. Research on analogical reasoning in innovation by Gentner, Holyoak, and Kokinov (2001) in "The Analogical Mind: Perspectives from Cognitive Science" demonstrates how individuals draw on diverse experiences to generate novel solutions to current challenges. Their comprehensive examination of analogical thinking shows how successful innovators often make connections across seemingly unrelated domains. This suggests that organizations should value and leverage the full range of experiences that employees bring to innovation efforts.

The dynamic nature of competence requirements in innovation contexts means that the Competence dimension must include not only current capabilities but also the capacity for continuous learning and development. This aligns with the concept of learning agility—the ability to learn quickly from experience and apply that learning to new and different situations.

Commitment: Engagement, Loyalty, and Motivation

The Commitment dimension addresses the motivational and emotional aspects of innovation that are often overlooked in technical approaches to innovation management. The framework identifies three key components of commitment: employee engagement, loyalty, and motivation, each of which contributes to the psychological conditions necessary for sustained innovation effort.

Employee engagement, as conceptualized in the framework, goes beyond simple job satisfaction to encompass what Kahn (1990) describes as the "harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles" in his Academy of Management Journal article "Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work." Kahn's pioneering research on personal engagement shows how individuals bring their full selves to their work when certain psychological conditions are met. Engaged employees bring their full selves to their work, investing not only their time and effort but also their creativity, passion, and personal commitment to organizational goals.

The loyalty component of commitment addresses the importance of emotional attachment to the organization and its mission. However, the framework's approach to loyalty is not blind allegiance but rather what might be termed "intelligent loyalty"— commitment that is based on shared values and mutual respect rather than dependence or fear. This type of loyalty creates the psychological safety necessary for the risk taking and experimentation that innovation requires.

Motivation, the third component of commitment, encompasses both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. Research by Amabile and Kramer (2011) in "The Progress Principle: Using Small Wins to Ignite Joy, Engagement, and Creativity at Work" on "the progress principle" demonstrates that the most powerful motivator for creative work is the experience of making meaningful progress toward important goals. Their extensive diary study of knowledge workers reveals how daily progress in meaningful work creates positive emotions and sustained motivation. This suggests that the Commitment dimension must include not only initial motivation but also ongoing reinforcement through meaningful work and visible progress.

The framework's emphasis on fostering commitment "across diverse organizational units" recognizes that innovation often requires coordination and collaboration across organizational boundaries. This cross-unit commitment is particularly challenging in large, complex organizations where different units may have competing priorities or conflicting performance metrics.

Consistency: Harmony with Adaptation

The Consistency dimension addresses one of the fundamental tensions in innovation management: the need to maintain coherent policies and practices while allowing for the flexibility and adaptation that innovation requires. The framework's approach to consistency is nuanced, emphasizing "harmony in innovation policies and

practices across different units and locations, while allowing for necessary adaptations based on local requirements."

This approach reflects what might be called "principled flexibility"—consistency in fundamental principles and values combined with flexibility in implementation approaches. This concept aligns with research on organizational ambidexterity by O'Reilly and Tushman (2013) in their Academy of Management Perspectives article "Organizational Ambidexterity: Past, Present, and Future," which examines how organizations can simultaneously pursue efficiency and innovation, stability and change. Their longitudinal studies of ambidextrous organizations demonstrate how successful companies maintain consistent strategic direction while adapting their operational approaches to local conditions and changing circumstances.

The framework recognizes that absolute consistency can be counterproductive in innovation contexts, where local conditions, market requirements, and cultural factors may necessitate different approaches. However, complete inconsistency can lead to fragmentation, confusion, and inefficiency. The challenge is to identify the appropriate level of consistency for different aspects of innovation management.

The Consistency dimension also addresses the temporal aspects of innovation management. Innovation processes often unfold over extended time periods, during which organizational priorities, market conditions, and competitive landscapes may change significantly. Maintaining consistency in innovation efforts requires the ability to adapt to changing circumstances while preserving core commitments and strategic direction.

Practical implementation of the Consistency dimension requires sophisticated governance mechanisms that can distinguish between essential elements that require consistency and contextual elements that benefit from adaptation. This might involve developing what could be termed "innovation principles" that provide guidance for decision-making while allowing for local interpretation and implementation.

Compliance: Legal, Regulatory, and Ethical Standards.

The Compliance dimension of the 7C Framework addresses an increasingly important aspect of innovation management that is often overlooked in traditional innovation frameworks. As innovation activities become more complex and far-reaching in their implications, organizations must ensure that their innovation efforts adhere to labor laws, regulations, and ethical standards across all areas of operation. The framework's approach to compliance goes beyond mere legal adherence to encompass what might be termed "ethical innovation"—innovation that considers not only what is legally permissible but also what is ethically responsible. This broader view of compliance reflects growing societal expectations that organizations consider the broader implications of their innovations for various stakeholders. Risk management, as identified in the framework, is a critical component of innovation compliance. Innovation inherently involves uncertainty and risk,

but these risks must be managed responsibly. This includes not only technical and market risks but also social, environmental, and ethical risks that may not be immediately apparent but could have significant long-term consequences.

The global nature of many contemporary organizations adds complexity to the Compliance dimension. Organizations operating across multiple jurisdictions must navigate different legal and regulatory environments while maintaining coherent innovation strategies. This requires sophisticated understanding of regulatory landscapes and proactive engagement with regulatory bodies.

The framework's emphasis on compliance across "all areas of operation" recognizes that innovation affects multiple organizational functions and stakeholder groups. Compliance must therefore be integrated into innovation processes from the earliest stages rather than treated as an afterthought or constraint.

Cost-Effectiveness: Quality with Efficiency.

The Cost-Effectiveness dimension addresses the economic realities of innovation management while maintaining emphasis on quality and standards. The framework's approach recognizes that innovation must be economically sustainable to be viable over the long term, but cost considerations should not compromise the fundamental quality of innovation efforts.

The framework's emphasis on managing "innovation costs effectively, while maintaining the highest standards in all innovation activities" reflects a sophisticated understanding of the relationship between cost and quality in innovation. This approach rejects both the false economy of cutting costs at the expense of quality and the inefficiency of pursuing quality without regard to cost considerations. Effective cost management in innovation requires understanding the different types of costs involved in innovation processes. These include not only direct costs such as research and development expenses but also indirect costs such as opportunity costs, coordination costs, and the costs of failed innovations. The framework's approach suggests the need for comprehensive cost accounting that captures the full economic impact of innovation activities.

The Cost-Effectiveness dimension also addresses the challenge of measuring return on innovation investment. Unlike many other organizational investments, innovation investments often have uncertain outcomes and extended payback periods. This requires sophisticated approaches to investment evaluation that can account for both tangible and intangible benefits of innovation activities. The framework's integration of cost-effectiveness with the other six dimensions suggests that cost considerations should not be treated in isolation but rather as part of a holistic approach to innovation management. This means that cost-effectiveness must be balanced against considerations of culture, communication, competence, commitment, consistency, and compliance.

Discussion and Implications

Theoretical Contributions

The 7C Framework makes several important theoretical contributions to the field of innovation management. First, it provides a comprehensive integration of human factors and organizational dynamics that have often been treated separately in innovation research. By explicitly addressing the "human side of corporate innovation," the framework bridges gaps between technical approaches to innovation management and organizational behavior research.

The framework's emphasis on community and collaboration represents a significant departure from individualistic approaches to innovation that have dominated much of the literature. While individual creativity remains important, the 7C Framework positions innovation as fundamentally a collective endeavor that requires careful attention to interpersonal dynamics, cultural factors, and organizational systems.

The ecological metaphor employed in the Culture dimension offers a particularly valuable theoretical contribution. By conceptualizing organizational culture as an ecosystem that thrives through diversity and interdependence, the framework provides a more nuanced understanding of how cultural factors influence innovation than traditional approaches that may view culture as a constraint to be managed rather than a resource to be leveraged.

The framework's integration of compliance and ethical considerations into innovation management addresses a gap in traditional innovation frameworks. As innovations become more powerful and far-reaching in their implications, the need for frameworks that explicitly address ethical and regulatory considerations becomes increasingly important.

Practical Implications

The 7C Framework has significant practical implications for how organizations structure and manage their innovation efforts. The framework suggests that organizations should invest as much attention in developing their human and organizational capabilities for innovation as they do in developing technical capabilities.

The Communication dimension implies that organizations need to develop more sophisticated approaches to cross-functional and cross-disciplinary collaboration. This might involve creating new roles (such as innovation translators or boundary spanners), developing communication protocols that facilitate understanding across professional boundaries, and investing in communication technologies that support collaborative innovation.

The Competence dimension suggests that organizations need to take a more holistic approach to capability development that includes not only technical skills but also collaborative skills, learning agility, and appropriate attitudes toward innovation. This has implications for recruitment, training, performance management, and career development practices.

The Commitment dimension implies that organizations need to pay more attention to the motivational and emotional aspects of innovation. This

might involve redesigning work to provide more meaningful innovation challenges, creating recognition systems that celebrate both successful and failed innovation attempts, and developing leadership practices that inspire and sustain innovation commitment.

Implementation Challenges

While the 7C Framework provides valuable guidance for innovation management, its implementation faces several significant challenges. The comprehensive nature of the framework means that organizations must address multiple dimensions simultaneously, which can be resource-intensive and complex to coordinate. The framework's emphasis on cultural factors and human dynamics means that implementation cannot rely solely on structural or procedural changes. Organizations must also address deeper issues related to values, beliefs, and interpersonal relationships, which are often more difficult to change than formal systems and processes.

The interdependent nature of the seven dimensions means that weakness in any one area can undermine the effectiveness of the entire framework. This creates implementation challenges because organizations must maintain attention to all dimensions rather than focusing on areas where they may have existing strengths or where improvements may be easier to achieve.

The global nature of many contemporary organizations adds complexity to framework implementation. Different cultural, legal, and market contexts may require different approaches to each dimension, while maintaining overall coherence and consistency across the organization.

Measurement and Evaluation

One of the challenges facing organizations seeking to implement the 7C Framework is the difficulty of measuring progress and effectiveness across all seven dimensions. While some aspects of the framework (such as cost-effectiveness) may be relatively straightforward to measure, others (such as culture and commitment) involve more subjective and complex phenomena.

The framework implies the need for comprehensive measurement systems that can capture both quantitative and qualitative indicators of innovation performance. This might involve developing new metrics for assessing cultural alignment, communication effectiveness, competence development, commitment levels, consistency maintenance, compliance adherence, and cost-effectiveness achievement. The dynamic and interactive nature of the seven dimensions suggests that measurement systems must also capture the relationships and interactions between dimensions rather than treating each dimension in isolation. This requires more sophisticated analytical approaches that can account for the complex, multidimensional nature of innovation performance.

Future Research Directions

The 7C Framework opens several avenues for future research in innovation management. Empirical studies could examine the relative importance of different dimensions in different organizational contexts, industries, or

cultural settings. Such research could help organizations prioritize their improvement efforts and adapt the framework to their specific circumstances. Research could also examine the dynamic relationships between the seven dimensions over time. How do changes in one dimension affect others? What are the optimal sequences for implementing improvements across multiple dimensions? How do the relationships between dimensions change as organizations mature in their innovation capabilities?

The framework's emphasis on community and collaboration suggests opportunities for research on network effects in innovation. How do the social networks within and around organizations influence the effectiveness of the 7C Framework? What are the optimal network structures for supporting each dimension of the framework? Cross-cultural research could examine how the 7C Framework applies in different national and organizational cultures. Are all seven dimensions equally important across different cultural contexts? How should the framework be adapted for organizations operating in multiple cultural environments?

Limitations and Considerations

While the 7C Framework provides valuable insights for innovation management, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. The framework's comprehensive nature may make it challenging for organizations with limited resources to implement effectively. Organizations may need to prioritize certain dimensions or implement the framework gradually over time.

The framework's emphasis on human and organizational factors, while important, should not obscure the continued importance of technical and methodological aspects of innovation. The 7C Framework is best understood as complementing rather than replacing technical approaches to innovation management.

The framework's applicability may vary across different types of innovation, organizational contexts, and industry settings. Organizations should carefully consider their specific circumstances when implementing the framework and be prepared to adapt it as needed.

Finally, the framework's effectiveness depends heavily on leadership commitment and organizational readiness for change. Organizations that lack strong leadership support or that have significant cultural or structural barriers to change may find it difficult to implement the framework successfully.

Conclusion

The 7C Framework for Innovation Management represents a significant contribution to the field of innovation management by providing a comprehensive approach that explicitly addresses the human side of corporate innovation. The framework's seven dimensions—Culture, Communication, Competence, Commitment, Consistency, Compliance, and Cost-Effectiveness—offer organizations a structured approach to creating the conditions necessary for sustained innovation success.

The framework's central insight that "it takes a community to innovate" challenges traditional approaches to innovation management that may focus primarily on technical or process-oriented aspects while neglecting the complex human and organizational dynamics that ultimately determine innovation success. By positioning innovation as fundamentally a collaborative and social endeavor, the framework provides guidance for organizations seeking to harness the creative potential of diverse, professionally heterogeneous teams.

The ecological metaphor employed in the Culture dimension offers a particularly valuable perspective on organizational innovation. Just as ecological systems thrive through diversity and interdependence, innovative organizations benefit from the creative tension and cross-pollination that occurs when diverse perspectives interact effectively. However, this diversity must be actively managed through the other dimensions of the framework to ensure that it contributes to rather than detracts from innovation goals.

The framework's integration of all seven dimensions reflects the complex, multifaceted nature of innovation management in contemporary organizations. Each dimension addresses critical aspects of the innovation process, from the foundational cultural and communication elements through the operational aspects of competence development and cost management. The interdependent nature of these dimensions means that organizations must attend to all aspects simultaneously rather than focusing on isolated elements.

The practical implications of the 7C Framework are significant. Organizations implementing this framework must be prepared to invest in developing not only their technical innovation capabilities but also their human and organizational capabilities. This includes creating more sophisticated approaches to cross-functional collaboration, developing comprehensive competence development programs, fostering deep employee commitment to innovation goals, maintaining consistency while allowing for necessary adaptation, ensuring compliance with legal and ethical standards, and managing costs effectively while maintaining quality.

The framework's emphasis on compliance and ethical considerations is particularly timely given growing societal expectations that organizations consider the broader implications of their innovations. As innovations become more powerful and far reaching, the need for frameworks that explicitly address ethical and regulatory considerations becomes increasingly important.

While the 7C Framework provides valuable guidance for innovation management, its implementation faces several challenges. The comprehensive nature of the framework requires significant organizational commitment and resources. The emphasis on cultural factors and human dynamics means that implementation cannot rely solely on structural changes but must also address deeper issues related to values, beliefs, and relationships. The interdependent nature of the dimensions means that weakness in any area can undermine overall effectiveness. Despite these challenges, the 7C Framework offers organizations a

roadmap for creating more effective innovation environments. The framework's emphasis on community, collaboration, and human factors addresses critical gaps in traditional innovation management approaches. Organizations that successfully implement the framework may find themselves better positioned to navigate the complex challenges of contemporary innovation while creating more engaging and meaningful work environments for their employees.

Future research should examine the empirical effectiveness of the framework across different organizational contexts, industries, and cultural settings. Research should also explore the dynamic relationships between the seven dimensions and identify optimal implementation strategies for different types of organizations. Cross-cultural research could examine how the framework should be adapted for organizations operating in multiple cultural environments.

In conclusion, the 7C Framework for Innovation Management provides a valuable contribution to both innovation theory and practice. By explicitly addressing the human side of corporate innovation, the framework offers organizations a more complete approach to innovation management that recognizes innovation as fundamentally a human and collaborative endeavor. As organizations continue to face increasingly complex innovation challenges, frameworks like the 7C model that integrate technical, human, and organizational considerations will become increasingly important for achieving sustained innovation success.

The framework's core message—that successful innovation requires finding effective ways to work with people across organizational boundaries—offers a powerful reminder that innovation is ultimately about human creativity, collaboration, and community. Organizations that embrace this perspective and implement the comprehensive approach outlined in the 7C Framework may find themselves better equipped to unlock the full innovation potential of their human resources while creating positive impacts for all stakeholders.

References

Ahmed, P. K. (1998). Culture and climate for innovation. *European Journal of*

Innovation Management, 1(1), 30-43. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601069810199131

Amabile, T. M. (1998). How to kill creativity. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(5), 7787.

Amabile, T., & Kramer, S. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Carlile, P. R. (2004). Transferring, translating, and transforming: An integrative framework for managing knowledge across boundaries. *Organization Science*, 15(5), 555-568. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1040.0094

Cooper, R. G., Edgett, S. J., & Kleinschmidt, E. J. (2001). *Portfolio*

management for new products (2nd ed.). Perseus Publishing.

Cross, R., & Sproull, L. (2004). More than an answer: Information relationships for actionable knowledge. *Organization Science*, 15(4), 446-462. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1040.0075

Dobni, C. B. (2008). Measuring innovation culture in organizations: The development of a generalized innovation culture construct using exploratory factor analysis.

European Journal of Innovation Management, 11(4), 539-559. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060810911156

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams.
Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350-383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Engelberg, S. (2025, March). *It Takes a Community to Innovate: The 7C Framework for Innovation Management: A comprehensive approach to the human side of corporate innovation* [Keynote Address]. International Association of Organizational Innovation Conference, Bali, Indonesia.

Gentner, D., Holyoak, K. J., & Kokinov, B. N. (Eds.). (2001). *The analogical mind: Perspectives from cognitive science*. MIT Press.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. https://doi.org/10.2307/256287

Leonard-Barton, D. (1995). *Wellsprings of knowledge: Building and sustaining the sources of innovation*. Harvard Business School Press.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71 Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

O'Reilly, C. A., III, & Tushman, M. L. (2013). Organizational ambidexterity: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(4), 324-338. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0025

Radjou, N., Prabhu, J., & Ahuja, S. (2012). *Jugaad innovation: Think frugal, be flexible, generate breakthrough growth*. Jossey-Bass.

Ramamoorthy, N., Flood, P. C., Slattery, T., & Sardessai, R. (2005). Determinants of innovative work behaviour: Development and test of an integrated model. *Creativity and Innovation Management*,

14(2), 142-150. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467869 1.2005.00334.x

Rothwell, R. (1994). Towards the fifth-generation innovation process. *International Marketing Review*, 11(1), 7-31. https://doi.org/10.1108/02651339 410057491

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.

https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2Z

Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(5), 79-90.

Tidd, J., & Bessant, J. (2020). *Managing innovation: Integrating technological, market and organizational change* (7th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Tushman, M. L., & Scanlan, T. J. (1981). Boundary spanning individuals: Their role in information transfer and their antecedents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(2), 289-305. https://doi.org/10.2307/255842